Vol. XVI, No. 3 OCTOBER, 1957

E-24

THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

CONTENTS

Page

CONCERNING THE ORIGIN OF THE IMPROPERIA 65
By the Rev. Professor Hermann Sasse, D.Theol., Immanuel Theological Seminary, Adelaide.

WARFIELD ON THE SCRIPTURES 76
By the Rev. Professor J. F. Peter, B.A., B.D., Dip.Ed., Emmanuel College, University of Queensland.

BOOK REVIEWS 84
(See inside back cover)

PRICE: THREE SHILLINGS

THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

EDITORS:

THE VERY REV. PRINCIPAL S. BARTON BABBAGE, M.A., Ph.D., Th.D., Melbourne.
THE REV. ROBERT SWANTON, M.A., B.D., Melbourne.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

THE REV. JOHN AITKEN, B.A., B.D., Bendigo, Vic.
THE REV. J. A. MUNRO FORD, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Adelaide.
THE REV. M. W. J. GEURSEN, B.A., B.D., Melbourne.
THE VEN. ARCHDEACON T. C. HAMMOND, M.A., Th.D., Sydney.
THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN HENDERSON, M.A., Ph.D., Dunedin.
THE REV. PROFESSOR D. S. HOPKIRK, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D., Melbourne.
THE REV. D. BROUGHTON KNOX, B.A., B.D., M.Th., D.Phil., Sydney.
THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN McINTYRE, M.A., B.D., D.Litt., Edinburgh.
THE REV. NEIL MacLEOD, M.A., B.D., Hamilton, Vic.
THE REV. L. L. MORRIS, B.Sc., B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., Melbourne
THE REV. PROFESSOR J. F. PETER, B.A., B.D., Dip.Ed., Brisbane.

Contributors enjoy reasonable liberty in the exposition of the Christian Faith. The Editors are not responsible for every opinion that may be expressed.

ISSUED THRICE YEARLY

Communications and Subscriptions should be forwarded to the Editors, The Manse, 304 Glenferrie Road, Hawthorn, E.2, Victoria, Australia. Subscribers in New Zealand should forward their subscriptions to the Presbyterian Bookroom, P.O. Box 389, Dunedin.

Annual Subscription:
Ten Shillings, including postage. (Foreign, 10/6.)

THE
REFORMED
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Vol. XVI, No. 3 OCTOBER, 1957

Concerning the Origin of the Improperia

One of the most moving and truly evangelical pieces of the liturgy of Good Friday are the Improperia, the reproaches of the Crucified against His people. Since they present some important theological problems and seem to have deeply influenced the theologia crucis which is so significant for Western Christendom, an attempt to trace their history back to the church of the second century might be of more than mere historical interest.

I

The "Improperia" are closely connected with the adoration of the Cross and with the "Trishagion" and can be understood only in this context. In the present Roman rite which goes back to the Middle Ages — a somewhat simpler form is presented by the Sarum Missal — the priest shows the veiled crucifix and, while unveiling it more and more, sings three times: "Behold the wood of the Cross (Ecce lignum crucis) on which the Saviour of the world hung," whereupon the choir each time reply: "Come let us adore" (venite adoremus). During the adoration the Improperia are sung. They consist of two parts, the first being regarded as the more important one which seems to have been used exclusively in the Middle Ages, as the Sarum Missal and other sources suggest. It comprises three reproaches, based on Old Testament passages in which God complains of the ingratitude of His people. "My people, what have I done unto thee and wherein have I offended thee? Answer Me. Because I brought thee out of the land of Egypt, thou hast prepared a cross for thy Saviour." (Populo meus, quid feci tibi? aut in quo contristavi te? Responde mihi. Quia eduxi te de terra Aegypti, parasti crucem salvatori tuo.) This is, apart from the last words, literally taken from Micah 6:3f. (comp. Jerem. 7:22). The second reproach has its roots in Jer. 2:6f., comp. 7:22, and reads "Because I led thee (quia eduxi te) through the desert forty years, and fed thee with manna, and brought thee into a land exceedingly

good, thou hast prepared a cross for thy Saviour." The third reproach stems from Is. 5:2, 4, comp. Jer. 2:21: "What could I have done more unto thee that I have not done. I planted thee, indeed, my most beautiful vineyard, and thou hast become exceeding bitter unto me. For in my thirst thou gavest me vinegar to drink, and with a lance thou piercedst the side of thy Saviour." (Quid ultra debui facere tibi et non feci. Ego quidem plantavi te vineam meam speciosissimam, et tu facta es mihi nimis amara. Aceto namque sitim meam potasti, et lancea perforasti latus salvatoris tui.) Each of these reproaches is answered by two choirs alternately singing in Greek and Latin the "Trishagion":

Agios o Theos	Sanctus Deus
Agios ischyros	Sanctus fortis
Agios athanatos	Sanctus immortalis
Eleeison imas[1]	Miserere nobis.

"O Holy God, O Holy strong One, O Holy immortal One, have mercy upon us."

The second part consists of nine further reproaches in which the Crucified reminds His people of the benefits He has bestowed on it from the liberation from Egypt to their entrance into the Promised Land, and of the acts of ingratitude committed by Israel in the Passion, each of these reproaches being followed by the "Populo meus" with which the Improperia begin. In a most impressive way each act of divine mercy is contrasted with a corresponding act of human ingratitude. In each case a certain word or thought provides the parallel between what has happened in the deliverance of Israel and in the passion of Christ. Leaving out the constant refrain "My people . . .", these reproaches read as follows:

"For thy sake I scourged Egypt with its first-born:
and thou has scourged Me and delivered Me up.

I brought thee out of Egypt having drowned Pharoah in the Red Sea:
and thou has delivered Me to the chief priests.

I opened the sea before thee:
and thou with a lance hast opened My side.

I went before thee with a pillar of cloud:
and thou hast led me to the judgment hall of Pilate.

I fed thee with manna in the desert:
and thou hast beaten Me with blows and scourges.

I gave thee the water of salvation from the rock to drink:
and thou hast given Me gall and vinegar.

---

1. We give the text here in the Latin transcription of the Missale Romanum. The Gallician and Mozarabic have older forms of the "aius" which try to render the pronunciation of the later Greek, which is almost the same as today.—The reader is asked to follow up our quotations in a Latin missal.

For thee I struck the kings of the Chanaanites:
and thou hast struck My head with a reed.

I gave thee a royal sceptre:
and thou hast given to My head a crown of thorns.

I have exalted thee with great power:
and thou hast hanged Me on the gibbet of the Cross.

The Improperia are followed by an antiphon which resumes the idea of the adoration of the cross. Then Venantius Fortunatus' great hymn on the cross "Pangue lingua gloriosi lauream certaminis" with the "Crux fidelis" as refrain is sung.

II

The Improperia in connection with the adoration of the cross and the Trishagion in Greek and Latin are first to be found in the Mozarabic liturgy. The "Missale Mixtum secundum Regulam Beati Isidori" (Migne PL 85, 430f.) has the text of the three reproaches with negligible variations, while the "Breviarium Gothicum" (Migne PL 86, 610f.) contains after the first reproach, "Populo meus, quid feci tibi? In quo contristavi te? Responde mihi. Quia eduxi te de terra Aegypti, parasti crucem mihi," seven other Bible passages, most of them taken from Micah 6 so that practically the whole context Micah 6:1-8 is quoted, each passage being set into the framework "Populo meus" — "Quia eduxi." This seems to be a secondary form, as some of these verses like 6, 7 and 8 are not reproaches. The reason for this form with its admonitions may be found in the fact that in the Mozarabic liturgy this service of Good Friday (Parasceve) was connected with the reconciliation of the penitents as definitely prescribed by the Fourth Synod of Toledo (A.D. 633)[2]. Since the Mozarabic rite has been derived from the Gallican liturgy the question arises whether the reproaches have their origin there. There is, however, no trace of them to be found in Gallican sources before the ninth century, though the Trishagion and Adoration of the Cross belong to the Gallican rite. The fact that the "Pangue lingua" belongs to the liturgy of "Parasceve" in the Breviarium Gothicum shows Gallican influence. For this hymn, composed at Poitiers by Venantius Fortunatus not later than 600 A.D., belongs to the most precious gifts which the Church of the Visigoths in Southern France and Spain received from her Frankish sister church after Rekkared had accepted the Catholic faith in 583 A.D.

2. See L. Duchesne, **Christian Worship**, transl. by M. L. McClure, 5th ed., London, 1949, p. 442f. Duchesne's assumption that the reconciliation took place in Milan, also on Good Friday, has been challenged. It could have belonged to the ceremonies of Maunday Thursday.

Before we can go on with further investigations of possible earlier traces of the Improperia, we have briefly to speak of their inseparable companions, the Trishagion and the adoration of the Cross. The Trishagion belongs to the Liturgy of the Greek Church. Its origin is unknown, the beautiful legend with which John of Damask (De fide orthodoxa III, cap. 10) concludes his explanation of this hymn suggests that it may have been introduced into the liturgy of Constantinople at the time of the Third Ecumenical Synod. It must be much older, for it occurs also in the Nestorian liturgy before the lessons as in the other Eastern liturgies. From the East it came into the Gallican liturgy where it appears in Greek and Latin, its place being before the lessons as in the East. Whatever its history in the West may be,[3] it proves the close connection between the Eastern and the Latin Churches of Gaul and Spain. There is no trace of a connection between the Trishagion and a passage in the liturgy of Good Friday in the present Eastern Church which corresponds to the Improperia of the West, a chant by the priest after Is. 53 has been read. There the Crucified reproaches Israel: "In what have I grieved you? Or wherewith have I caused you anger? Who has before me liberated you from distress? And now, how do you requite me? Evil for good. For the pillar of fire you prepared me the grave, for the manna you have brought me gall, for the water you have given me vinegar. Now I call the gentiles, and they will glorify me with the Father and the Holy Ghost."[4] We shall come back to this text, the origin of which I have not been able to trace. It is a complaint against the Jews, while the combination of the Latin reproaches with the Trishagion identifies the people of God with the Church. It is the Church, and especially the penitents, who ask for reconciliation, who listen to the reproaches of the Saviour and answer with the invocation of the holy, mighty and immortal God: "Eleison imas," "miserere nobis." While what we could call the Improperia in the Eastern Church remains an accusation of the Jews, the Improperia of the West are an expression of penitence. This is warranted by the Trishagion. Good Friday in the Eastern Church is a day of deepest sorrow and compassion. In the Western Church it becomes through the Improperia a day of repentance.

---

3. See Gregory Dix, **The Shape of the Liturgy**, p. 463ff., and the literature quoted there.

4. I have translated this from the German text in F. Heiler **Urkirche und Ostkirche** (1937), p. 348, after a reliable and competent Orthodox priest has kindly examined the text.

Also the connection with the Adoration of the Cross is of highest theological significance. We sons of the Reformation are inclined to look at such "adoration" as a subchristian, if not superstitious and even pagan, form of devotion. However, two things should not be forgotten. Firstly, that even within the Catholic Churches the problem of such worship has been felt, and Catholic scholars have called our attention to the fact that "crucem adorare" and "crucem salutare" are used in rubrics interchangeably. Adoratio is in the Latin of later antiquity what in Greek is called "proskynesis," the deep reverence which is due even to emperors and kings, as also the English "worship" can be used in a similar sense. Luther in his writing on the adoration of the Sacrament of the Blessed Body of Christ (1523) complains that there is no real translation of "adorare" in the secular sense. If even Jesus in John 10:35 can accept the Old Testament usage of "God" for "ruler," we must admit that it was not so easy for the Bible and the Church to avoid any expression which might have pagan implications. Even if we can never approve of the veneration of human beings or ikons, we should at least as historians admit that such forms of devotion are not simply "idolatry," though they easily can become that. Secondly, we should never forget that the veneration of what was regarded as the holy cross, allegedly rediscovered by Helena, or particles thereof, was the beginning of a development that led to the great theology of the cross of Western Christendom. It is astonishing how little the Early Church, the church of the martyrs, made use in its art of the cross as a symbol. For Constantine the sign of the cross was not must more than a magic symbol, the swastica of a ruthless and superstitious ruler. It became popular with the pagan masses which now entered the Church. The discovery of what became since the 4th century the most sacred relic for Church and Empire stirred up the imagination of the people who slowly were transformed from pagans into Christians. The veneration of the Holy Cross in the elaborate ceremonies of Holy Week in Jerusalem, as indicated first by Cyril about 350 and so vividly described by the Spanish pilgrim Aetheria in her famous Peregrinatio was one of the ways in which the pagan souls were christianised. Who will say how much paganism and how much Christian faith lived in the souls of those who on Good Friday kissed the Cross in deep emotion, the deacons watching that no one tried to bite off a splinter of the relic. The accompanying hymns and lessons, the stations along the traditional way of

Christ to Calvary, all this made the passion a reality. Still to-day the words "Behold the wood of the Cross on which hung the Saviour of the world" points back to the time when the relic itself was shown. The same process went on when the Germanic peoples were christianised. The splinter of the holy cross which Radegunda, the pious Queen of the Franks obtained in 569 at Poitiers from Emperor Justin II became not only the object of veneration by the people, but inspired also Venantius Fortunatus to compose his great hymns "Vexilla Regis prodeunt" and "Pangue lingua," just as later the famous Cross of Ruthwell in Scotland inspired Cynewulf's "Vision on the Holy Rood." The popularity of the relics of the cross and their veneration with all Germanic peoples, particularly the Anglo-Saxons, is evidently connected with the old Teutonic cult of sacred trees, the last triumph of which is the spread of the Christmas tree throughout the world to-day. How the old pagan cult was "baptised" — who would not think of the wise instructions which Gregory I gave to Augustine when he sent him to Kent? — is illustrated by the verse:

Crux fidelis, inter omnes
Arbor una nobilis:
Nulla silva talem profert
Fronde, flore, germine.
Dulce lignum, dulces clavos,
Dulce pondus sustinet.[5]

Or one may think of the way how in the "Pangue lingua" the story of Adam's fall and the story of the Incarnation and Passion of the second Adam are told in the manner and even in the terms of Irenaeus and how this Christian message, together with the legend of the Cross having been made from the tree of the Paradise, is blended with the remnants of that cult when the Cross is poetically addressed:

Flecte ramos, arbor alta
Tensa laxa viscera,
Et rigor lentescat ille,
Quem dedit nativitas.
Et superni membra Regis
Tende miti stipite.[6]

The adoration of the Cross has here become adoration of the Crucified, just as the pagan adoration of the light at winter solstice has become in our Christmas the adoration of Him who is the light of the world. This is the way in

5. Faithful Cross, O Tree all beauteous, / Tree all peerless and divine / Not a grove on earth can show us / Such a leaf and flower as thine, Sweet the nails and sweet the wood / Laden with so sweet a load.
6. Lofty Tree, bend down thy branches / To embrace thy sacred load / O relax the native tension / Of that all too rigid wood, Gently, gently bear the members / Of thy dying King and God.

which the Cross of Christ has become centre and theme of Western Christianity. It is a long way which led from the old relics to the Romanesque Crucifixus, the King who stands rather at, than hangs on the cross, to the man of sorrows in the Gothic cathedrals and to Grünewald's and Dürer's pictures of the Passion, from Fortunatus and Beda to St. Anselm and St. Bernhard and to the theologia crucis of Luther, Zinzendorf and the Wesleys, from the first hymns addressed to the Cross to Bach's passion music. The connection of the Improperia with the adoration of the cross has helped to overcome the primitive, pagan background of that adoration, as vice versa the Improperia gained their full meaning when they were sung in the spirit of "Salve caput cruentatum."

III

Where is the origin of the Improperia to be found? If we try to go back to the earlier centuries we cannot find them at the time when the adoration of the cross and the Trishagion are traceable. A happy discovery of one of the lost writings of Melito of Sardes, however, makes it possible to prove that at least the beginnings of the Improperia are as old as the second century. In 1936 Professor Campbell Bonner of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor announced in a symposium for Franz Cumont that Melito's Homily on the Passion ("Peri tou Pascha") which was known only from some small quotations had been found in a papyrus codex, some leaves of which were in the possession of Mr. Chester Beatty in England, while others belonged to the University of Michigan. Bonner's ingenious reconstruction produced one of the most important documents of the Church of Asia at the end of the 2nd century. In 1940 Dr. Bonner published the work in a masterly edition ("The Homily on the Passion by Melito Bishop of Sardis with some fragments of the apocryphal Ezechiel" edited by Campbell Bonner, London: Christophers, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press) which contains an elaborate introduction, the text with notes, and a translation. It seems that this masterpiece of modern scholarship has not yet found the attention it deserves, and we would like to call the attention of all those interested in the history of the Ancient Church, its theology and its liturgy, to this book.

Bonner, though mentioning in a footnote (p. 148) Micah 6:1-2 as a parallel to a passage in paragraph 87 has not seen the connection with the Improperia. But from the text as a whole it appears that the complaints of the Crucified against His ungrateful people belong to the

liturgy of the Christian "Pascha" of the 2nd century, at least in the Church of Asia. This "pascha"[7] was the celebration of the deliverance of the new people of God through the death and resurrection of the Saviour, the fulfilment of what had occurred in the exodus of Israel from Egypt. The exodus is the type of the redemption, as already Paul suggests in 1 Cor. 10:1ff. The Christian "pascha" is the commemoration of the death and resurrection of Christ. It is, so to speak, Good Friday and Easter celebrated on the same day, the christianised Passover of the Jews. The word "passa" is rendered by the LXX as "pascha" which suggests the "paschein," the suffering of the "Kyrios," as "Jahve" is translated. In this sense "pascha estin kyrioo" (Ex. 12:11 comp. Lev. 23:5; Num 28:16) is understood. Already Paul in our epistle for Easter, 1 Cor. 5:6-8, has this understanding. It was the common understanding of all Christians in the 2nd century, the quartadeciman controversy centering solely around the question whether the pascha must or must not be celebrated on the day of the Jewish passover. If the Church of Asia retained the Jewish date, she did so on the basis of its Johannine tradition according to which Jesus died at the very hour when the passover lambs were killed, and not on the 15th of Nisan. This tradition which is irreconcilable with the narrative of the synoptists was so strongly defended, even at the risk of a schism, because it confirmed the mysterious parallel between the deliverance from Egypt and the final redemption of the new people of God. But also they who held that the Christian pascha must be celebrated on a Lord's Day as the day of resurrection did at that time not distinguish between what later was called Good Friday and Easter. Both events were celebrated as one festival, the pascha, as the liturgical name for Easter is still to-day. A fasting of a day or some days was terminated during the night of pascha with the Eucharist. Then the "pentecoste" began which was the name not only for the 50th day, but rather of the whole period of seven weeks following "pascha." These are well known facts, corroborated by all early Fathers (Epistula apostolorum, Irenaeus, Hippolytos, Clemens Al., etc.[8]), but we must recall them in order to understand Melito's

7. See Gregory Dix, op. cit. p. 338ff, and the most important article on the Pascha of the Ancient Church by the late Benedictine Odo Casel, "Jahrbuch fur Liturgiewissenschaft" vol. xiv (1938), pp. 1-78. It hs remained unknown to Dix.

8. (Epistola apostolorum 15; Irenaeus adv. haer. IV:10,1; Hippolytos, Ref. VIII,18, and many other references, especiallly his Homily for Easter which has been discovered by Ch. Martin among the writings falsely ascribed to Chrysostum, Migne PG 59, 735-46; Tertullian eg. De idol. 14; Origenes, e.g. Contra Celsum VIII,22).

homily which was preached after the narrative of the exodus (Ex. 12) has been read which still belongs to the lessons of Good Friday. The homily begins with the words: "The Scripture of the Hebrew Exodus has been read, and the words of the mystery have been proclaimed, how the sheep (probaton) is sacrificed and how the people is saved." The events of the exodus are told and explained as "mystery," as "type" of the redemption brought about through the sacrifice of the true Lamb of God. "For indeed the salvation and truth of the Lord were foreshadowed in the people, and the ordinances of the Gospel were proclaimed beforehand by the Law. So the people became the pattern of the Church, and the Law the writing of a parable, and the Gospel the setting-forth and fulfilment of the Law."[9]

A most important theological feature of Melito's understanding of the exodus as well as of the entire Old Testament history is the way how he sees Christ already present in this history: "He is the pascha of our redemption, He it is who in many men suffered many things. This is He who in Abel was slain, in Isaac was bound, who in Jacob dwelt in a strange land, who in Joseph was sold, who in Moses was cast out, in the lamb was sacrificed, in David was hunted, in the prophets was dishonoured. This is He who was made flesh in a virgin, whose bones were not broken upon the tree, who in burial was not resolved into earth, who arose from the dead and raised man from the grave below to the heights of the heavens." This reminds of Paul's: "That Rock was Christ (1 Cor. 10:4). The type is not an empty symbol. It does not only signify the reality to which it points. It contains it already as a "mysterion" to be later revealed in the fulfilment.

We cannot discuss here the theology of Melito any further. Suffice it to state that his Christology, to say the least, lacks clarity. He regards Christ as God incarnate ("theos endysamenos ton anthropon") (par. 100 Bonner). This can be understood as modalism. He speaks of him as "buried as man, he arose from the dead as God" (par. 8) which sounds like Nestorian formulas. He distinguishes between Christ and the Father, when he makes Christ say: "Come hither all ye families of men . . . for I am your remission. I am the pascha of salvation, the Lamb that was sacrificed for you . . . I am the resurrection, I am your king, I lead you up to the heights of heavens, I will show you the Father (who is) from the ages" (103). This

9. With kind permission I follow the translation of Bonner except in cases where theology seems to demand some clearer expression. The quotations are given according to Bonner's paragraphs.

again seems to be a dangerous subordinationism. It is not surprising that later theologians found all sorts of heresies with Melito. But Melito was not a heretic. He was a profound religious thinker, as some of the fragments show, but his theology was still undeveloped. By his contemporaries he was regarded as a prophet, and a prophet he was. His style is that of ancient Christian prophecy out of which the language of the liturgy has grown. His Homily is perhaps after the Gospel of John and Revelation, the greatest example of such prophetic language.[10] He was "theologos" in the same sense in which St. John was called "the Divine," "ho theologos," which means primarily "the liturgist." The "eucharistia," the solemn prayer of the eucharistic liturgy, used to be spoken by the prophets (1 Cor. 14, 16), until the prophetic office more or less subsided and its functions were taken over by the bishops (Didache 10:7, 14:1). It is characteristic of Melito's charismatic language that it is impossible to distinguish between the preacher and the liturgist.

In this document we find for the first time the solemn reproaches of the Crucified against His people, which seem to have belonged to the liturgy of the early Christian "pascha" of the second century, long before, what the Greek theologians have called "pascha staurosimon" (Good Friday) and "pascha anastasimon" (Easter), were separated from each other. We have quoted a passage from the Eastern liturgy of Good Friday which corresponds to the Latin improperia, proving that both have the same source. The reader is asked to compare this quotation and the improperia of the Roman missal, including the second part with the following passages from Melito:

"Ye have returned unto me *evil for good*" (72). "Why, O Israel, hast thou done this strange wrong? Thou hast dishonored him who honored thee, thou hast held in contempt him who glorified thee, thou has denied him who acknowledged thee, thou hast renounced him who gave thee life. Thou hast done an impious deed, O Israel" (73f.).

"Come, he says, Israel, thou hast slain the Lord" (74).

"Thou didst put . . . *thorns upon his head*. Thou didst bind the beautiful hands with which he (shaped) thee from the earth; and his beautiful mouth, the mouth that fed thee with life,[11] thou hast fed with *gall*" (79).

"Thou wast of good cheer, while he was hungry; thou wast eating bread and drinking wine, while he drank *vinegar and gall* . . ."(80).

10. In this respect Bonner's excellent discussion of Melito's style (p. 20ff.) needs supplementation.
11. This resounds still in St. Bernard's 'Salve caput cruentatum."

"*He it was who guided thee on the way to Egypt and preserved thee and sustained thee there.* This was he who gave thee light by a *pillar of fire,* and shelter by a *cloud,* he who *divided the Red Sea and led thee across and destroyed* thine enemy. This is he who gave *manna from heaven,* who gave thee *water to drink from a rock,* who made laws for thee in Horeb who gave thee an inheritance in the *land* . . . who *raised up thy kings*" (84f.).

"*Come hither, Israel, and plead thy cause against me concerning thine ingratitude.* . . . How didst thou esteem the ten *plagues?* How didst thou value the *pillar by night and the cloud by day, and the crossing of the Red Sea?* How didst though value the *gift of manna from heaven, the gift of water from the rock* . . . and *the land of thine inheritance*" (87f.).

We have italicised the most convincing parallels. But one must read the entire text to see the close relationship existing between the Improperia and this homily. The reproaches of Jahveh, the Kyrios of the Old Testament, become the reproaches of the Crucified, the Kyrios of the New Testament. The idea underlying the second part of the Latin Improperia, the parallel between the exodus and the passion is most striking. As to the Eastern liturgy of Good Friday there is still another passage to be mentioned. After the Gospel has been read which closes with Jesus bearing the cross, a crucifix is carried in a sort of "entrance" through the church and shown from the Royal Door to the people, the priest chanting: "To-day he hangs on the tree who hung the earth above the waters . . ." In the homily we read: "He who hung the earth in its place is hanged, he who fixed the heavens is fixed upon the cross, he who made all things fast is made fast upon the tree" (96). A very important parallel between Melito and the Eastern liturgy is the fact that the reproaches are directed against the Jews. There is an anti-Jewish attitude in the Eastern Churches which probably goes back to terrible experiences the Church of Asia Minor had met since the days of Paul and John and which resounds even in the Gospel of St. John (comp. also Rev. 2:9 and 3:9; Acts 21:27). It belongs to the greatness of the Latin Improperia that they, by the insertion of the Trishagion with its "eleison imas," "miserere nobis," have referred the reproaches to the Church as the people of God, thus making them one of the most powerful expressions of the penitence by which the true Church of Christ lives.

H. SASSE.

Additional Note

When examining the context in which quotations from Melito are to be found in the late Fathers, the author came across a remarkable passage in the "Hodegos," by Anastasius Sinaita (not Patriarch of Antioch as Migne P.G. 89, 35, suggests, but an abbot from Mount Sinai) against Monophysites of all shades, written obviously in the middle of the 7th century during the Monotheletic Controversy. Refuting the use made by Monophysites of a passage from Melito's homily ("God suffered from an Israelitic hand"; the quotation is substantially correct, though not quite literal, as Anastasius apologises for having sometimes to quote from memory owing to the limited library facilities of the desert) and criticising the "theopaschitic" form of the Trishagion ("Holy God, Holy strong One, Holy immortal One, *crucified for us . . .*" he defends the orthodox Christology, emphasising the true humanity of our Lord. To make his point clear he draws a picture of the " staurosis," the crucifixion, or rather the crucified, after the pattern of a wooden bas relief he had made for himself. Thus this pious monk and defender of orthodoxy must have been an artist in his own right. He adds a "scholion": "We adjure by the Son of God him who copies this book that he should also copy exactly this picture." The later copyists seem to have faithfully obeyed this serious command. So the illustration is to be found at its proper place in Migne P.G. 89, col. 197. Investigations of the manuscripts, especially those which were not yet known to the editor of the text with Migne, will be made. The iconographical problem needs likewise investigation. None of the works on Christian art accessible to me mentions this unique representation of the Crucified. There is a close resemblance to the crucifixion scene in the evangeliarium of Rabbula of Edessa (A.D.586), e.g. in the use of sun and moon, an Egyptian symbol of eternity. There is, however, a very significant difference. Rabbula's illustration shows the painful suffering of the two thieves, while Christ, though tormented by the soldiers, shows no sign of suffering. Anastasius shows Christ as the man of sorrows. If the evidence of the manuscripts proves that we have here a faithful rendering of what Anastasius inserted in his book, this might be the oldest attempt to express by a book illustration, based on a bas relief which is lost forever, Christ's suffering on the Cross, a profound suffering, yet restrained in the way the Christian art of the East has always expressed it. In conjunction with the text it illustrates, it is another example of the theology of the cross which arose in the centuries of the disintegration of the Roman Empire and reached a climax in those Dark Ages when with the downfall of the Empire entire churches were so thoroughly wiped out that in Africa and the Near East the cross has never again become a sign of victory.

Warfield on the Scriptures

The years which have passed since the republication, under the title of "The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible,"[1] of some of the articles written by Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, have been time enough for us to judge what effect they should have upon the thought of this post-liberal era.

1. Published by the Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, 1948, and Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, London, 1951.

Warfield,[2] who was Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary, U.S.A., from 1887 until his death in 1921, was a renowned champion of the conservative point of view at a time when liberalism was cock of the walk, and many who hold that point of view are glad to look to his writings (and those of his student, Gresham Machen) as the ablest expressions of it. Though it is doubtful whether during his lifetime he was ever referred to as a "Fundamentalist," many who would willingly accept that designation for themselves will be found to subscribe to the views of which he was so notable an exponent.

It is not my intention here to present a summary of Warfield's views on the Bible. The volume which contains them is readily available; and it is one which should be read, not least by those who consider that the "Fundamentalist" position is one that cannot be supported at the bar of scholarship. In this volume can be found page after page of reasoned presentation based on carefully sifted evidence drawn from a wide field. And it is a feature of his writing that almost every page abounds in references to Biblical passages, so that he who would show that Warfield's understanding of some text is not that of the Biblical writer has an exegetical task of major magnitude before him.

There are, however, certain basic weaknesses in Warfield's position which, while perhaps not affecting a good deal of his detailed work, should lead to caution in the acceptance of his conclusions.

These basic weaknesses are four.

I

To any who are aware of Warfield's generally conservative opinions, and of the extent to which, in presentation of his case for the authority of the Bible, he calls for support from the sayings of Jesus, it may be surprising to have brought forward, as the first of the basic weaknesses in Warfield's position, his *failure to give a proper place to the fact of Jesus Christ.*

But Warfield is not the only "Fundamentalist" who, in a desire to preserve a particular kind of orthodoxy (even in respect of the doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ itself), has failed to appreciate what the unique Fact of that Person implies for the understanding of all

2. Since we live in a generation which knew not Warfield as a contemporary contender for an important point of view, some may be glad to have their attention drawn to the short accounts of his life given in recent issues of periodicals: "The Reformed Theological Review," ix. 4, pp. 30-1; "The Evangelical Quarterly," xxii, 2, pp. 115-122; xxiv, 3, pp. 175-6.

doctrines, and for the understanding to be had of revelation in particular.

1. One indication of this failure is that to which John McIntyre draws attention in his review of Warfield's volume: "It is inconceivable that any analysis of the Biblical idea of revelation can be adequate which devotes one page to the Revelation of God in Jesus Christ, and which does not make that Revelation the clue to the understanding of 'all forms of revelation' (Warfield's phrase), of which the Bible speaks."[3]

This is a very serious criticism of Warfield's approach, and one that cannot be answered on his behalf by saying that he is writing particularly about the way in which God reveals Himself through the *Bible,* and is not therefore to be expected to deal at length with the nature of His revelation in Christ — a subject which itself might call for a whole volume. The criticism cannot be answered in this way, because his subject (in the article which includes the one page which mentions the revelation in Jesus Christ) is precisely "The Biblical Idea of Revelation"; and it is just the prominence which the Biblical writers give to the place of Jesus Christ which Warfield neglects.

Formulation of doctrine is not to be proceeded with on a basis of statistics alone, but it is some support for the criticism I am advancing to have noted that, of the seventeen occurrences of the word *apokalupsis* (the word usually translated "revelation" in the Authorised Version), in the New Testament, no less than ten are with specific mention of Christ, and His association with "revelation" in at least some of the other occurrences is clearly implied. It is to be noted also that there is no occurrence of *apokalupsis* which has reference to the process which Warfield calls "concursive operation"; in fact, the only occurrences which seem to refer to a process which had a written document as its result (namely, Romans 16:25-26 and Revelation 1:1) can be advanced as evidence of the writers' understanding that what was written was subsequent to the revelation itself..

On a surface investigation of the occurrences of this one word, then, there can be made out a *prima facie* case against Warfield on the ground of his neglect of that "mode of revelation" to which the New Testament gives greatest prominence.

And the evidence aginst Warfield mounts up when other words are brought into consideration (even those to which he himself gives attention on pages 97 and 98), for

3. "The Reformed Theological Review," ix, 2, p. 20.

the use made of such words as *apokalupto, phaneroo* and *phanerosis* shows that when the thought of New Testament writers ran along lines of God's self-manifestation they ran at once to the Person of Jesus Christ.

One is drawn therefore to the conclusion that what Warfield gives us is not "the Biblical idea of revelation" at all, but an idea of "revelation" at which he has arrived on some other grounds, and for which he is able to adduce Scriptural statements which (there being certain suppositions already in mind) seem to give support to his view.

The paragraph on page 96 devoted to the revelation in Jesus Christ suggests Warfield's disagreement with the line his own argument is taking.[4] It is a pity that he did not revise his whole conception of revelation in the light of some of the things he says there, and that he did not make Christ the norm by which other modes of revelation are to be assessed.

2. The failure to give proper place to the fact of Jesus Christ is discernible also in the manner in which Warfield assumes that the New Testament writers regarded their new Scriptures in exactly the same way as they regarded the old.

In an Appendix which is printed on pages 411-416, he gives an account of the development of the canon, which leads to the conclusion that, since the writings relating to the new covenant were placed beside those of the old, what the New Testament writers display as their attitude to the old "Scriptures" is to be considered as indicative also of the attitude to be adopted to the new.

But, even if we allow that the early Christians did in fact consider the Old Testament Scriptures to be infallibly inspired, must we assume that they considered the new covenant to be made known in exactly the same way?

Some aspects of the teaching of Jesus Himself had pointed to an understanding of Scripture different from the orthodox interpretation of His day; had it not been, He would not have had need to protest against the orthodox interpreters that He was not come to destroy but to fulfil; and the application by the first Christians to Him of the very title "Word" suggests a recognition on their part that, with His coming, God was speaking in a different way. "This," as John MacLeod remarks (with a slightly different reference), "was more than addition, it was

4. Warfield says there, inter alia: "the revelation accumulated in Him stands outside all the divers portions and divers manners in which otherwise revelation has been given and sums up in itself all that has been or can be known of God and His redemption."

transformation of every finding by the creative deed which was His life among men. In that witness He was known to them as the Word, the Word Incarnate, the 'unspeakable' gift of God."[5]

II

What has been said leads naturally to discussion of the second basic weakness in Warfield's view of the Bible: his *failure to treat properly of the idea of revelation.* Having neglected to make Jesus Christ the norm of revelation, he seems to have found no other, with the result that he is not clear in his own mind as to what revelation really is.

1. This uncertainty is disclosed in the three "modes of revelation" under which, he says, all the forms of revelation in the Bible may be subsumed.[6] These three modes are: external manifestation (or theophany — characteristically the mode of the Patriarchal age), internal suggestion (or prophecy — characteristically the mode from the time of Samuel onwards) and concursive operation (or inspiration — characteristically the mode of the New Testament period).[7]

It is difficult to see what are the properties of the *genus* of which these three are supposed to be *species.* The second and third differ from the first in that they arise in the absence of any factor not to be located within the prophet or writer (the "concursive operation" in the third is as "internal" as the "internal suggestion" in the second), whereas the very characteristic of the first is that it is "external." What, then, is common to "external manifestation" on the one hand, and "internal suggestion" and "concursive operation" on the other? It can be said only that these three "modes" have in common the fact that they are ways in which God makes Himself known. But Warfield's contention is that no series of redemptive acts (which, presumably, "external manifestations" are) can properly be designated "revelation" unless "they are contemplated as designed to produce knowledge of God and His purpose and methods of grace"[8] — and how can such contemplation of external manifestations arise if there be not also "internal suggestion"? It seems then that what

---

5. "The Expository Times," lxii, p. 177.
It is possible, to say the least of it, that my remarks in this paragraph have the support of II Peter, 1:18-9, which Moffat translates: "we who were beside Him on the sacred hill . . . have gained fresh confirmation of the prophetic word." It is significant that the customary thoroughness of Warfield is not apparent in the treatment he gives to these words on pp. 135-7, his presuppositions allowing him to see only one possible interpretation: namely, that "the prophetic word affords a more sure basis of confidence than even the testimony of human eye-witnesses." (p. 136).
6. p. 96. 7. p. 83. 8. p. 80.

Warfield distinguishes as his first "mode of revelation" is not complete without the occurrence also of another of his "modes."

Again, it is difficult to see what distinction there is between the second and the third "modes." If there is to be (and Warfield insists that there is[9]) any activity in the part of the writer in the process which he calls "concursive operation," leading to the production of documents, there must surely be some prior operation in the writer's mind forming the basis with which God's operation "concurs." Thus "concursive operation follows (logically, if not chronologically) upon some sort of "internal suggestion"; and these two are hardly to be placed side by side as species of the same genus.

2. Such considerations as these lead to the suspicion that certain inconsistencies[10] in Warfield's presentation, which might charitably be ascribed to the passing of the years having brought about changes in his terminology, are really due to his being himself not clear as to what constitutes a revelation. The impression is gained that Warfield was convinced that the Bible is in itself a special and infallible revelation, and that that fact blinded him to the need for making a thorough investigation of what the concept "revelation" really involves.

III

A third basic weakness in the position of Warfield is, despite the many evidences of painstaking scholarship in the fixing of the meanings of particular words and phrases, his *failure to appreciate aright the Biblical perspective.*

1. T. F. Torrance draws attention to this failure when he writes: "No one who has learned from Kittel's *Theologisches Woerterbuch zum Neuen Testament,* and the Biblical studies which that massive dictionary represents, will want to go back to the way in which Dr. Warfield expounded Scripture, reading too readily time-conditioned philosophical categories and nuances into New Testament terms which are actually alien to them. . . . He draws the line of logical continuity just where the Bible itself refuses to draw it and makes us suspend judgment

9. pp. 83, 94-5.

10. A comparison of Chapters I and III (both of which are articles written for an encyclopaedia published in 1915) on the one hand, and Appendix II (which is an address delivered in 1879) on the other, will show that what (namely, "inspiration") is in one place purposely distinguished from "revelation" is in two other places described as one of its modes, what (namely, the result of inspiration) is in one place referred to "passively" as "inspiration" is in another place called "passively" a "revelation," and what is in one place said to have to do with the "acquirement" of truth and not with communication of it is said in another place to be the explanatory word added to a series of redemptive acts

in the face of an incomprehensible act of grace whose mode of operation will only be disclosed in the *eschaton.* To suspend judgment is not to be irrational; rather is it the part of reason which behaves obediently in terms of its object, in this instance, an objective Revelation which even in the event of revelation remains a *mysterion,* and will not yield its secret to analytical and logical investigation."[11]

2. This failure to appreciate the living "dynamic" relationship which the Scriptures presuppose in all that they say of God's dealings with man may be seen in Warfield's understanding of inspiration.

It is Warfield's understanding[12] that it is the one act of inspiration (itself a mode of revelation) which causes both (i) the words written to be infallible, and (ii) the present-day reader to hear the Divine voice speaking to him.

Warfield's trouble is that he cannot conceive of God speaking to me *now* unless He do so through a means which He prepared perfectly *then,* that he feels it necessary to state that God's having inspired writers (or, as he himself would say, writings) *then* means that what was written must be used of God in *every now,* and that withal he senses that what God says *now* is not determined entirely (as to its *occasion;* we are not discussiong here its *content*) by what He did *then.* We have here the confusion which G. T. Thomson (or is it Ernst Bizer?)[13] notes as the confusion of the entire "verbal inspiration" school, and we must note it as a failure to appreciate aright the Biblical perspective, even if we agree that "verbal inspiration is nearly right and an excellent rule of thumb."

3. It is alongside these signs of Warfield's having failed to appreciate aright the Biblical perspective that we may note what John McIntyre calls Warfield's "misrepresentation of the manner in which Scripture writers deliver doctrine."[14] The criticism seems to be that it is enough for Warfield that one and another of the Biblical writers declare that Scripture is "God-breathed," or that men

---

11. 'Scottish Journal of Theology," vii, pp. 105-7.
12. See p. 158.
13. The statement occurs in the English edition of Heppe, where it is not made plain whether the comment is by the translator or the reviser. He says: "One should notice how confused Voetius is for instance, and the confusion is that of the entire 'verbal inspiration' school. At one moment he declares that Scripture shines by its own light; the next he (rightly) declares that the intervention of the Holy Spirit is indispensable . . . the fact that the Reformed theology has such a strong hold upon the Holy Spirit as the so-called subjective principle helps us to appreciate the other fact that verbal inspiration is nearly right and an excellent rule of thumb." (Heinrich Heppe: **Reformed Dogmatics**, revised and edited by Ernst Bizer, and translated by G. T. Thomson; London, Allen and Unwin, 1950; p. 26).
14. "The Reformed Theological Review," ix, 2, p. 21.

"carried away by the Holy Spirit spoke from God," and the infallible inspiration of the Bible is an established doctrine. He has failed to appreciate, says McIntyre, that "doctrine is not delivered in so many words," but "has emerged through the Church interpreting Scripture — admittedly in the wisdom of the Spirit."

But the impression with which I myself am left after reading Warfield's presentation is that the position he has reached is far from being made up of doctrine "delivered in so many words."[15] It is, on the contrary, a thorough-going attempt to "interpret" Scripture, and one which, Warfield himself is insistent, agrees with that which the Church (in the wisdom of the Spirit) generally has made. That I cannot accept the "facts" as Warfield presents them is not because I consider him to have misrepresented the manner in which doctrinal "facts" are to be arrived at. It is because I consider his interpretation of the data to have fallen short of thoroughness.

IV

The fourth basic weakness to be noted in Warfield's position is his *failure to take due account of man as fallen.*

1. I am not, in speaking thus of Warfield's failure to take due account of man as fallen, concurring in the criticism which T. F. Torrance makes of him in these terms. His criticism is that verbal inspiration does for the miracle of Scripture what the Romanist doctrine of the immaculate conception does for the miracle of the Virgin Birth: in failing to understand the *quanti ponderis sit peccatum,* it drags the miracle down "into a series of logically concatenated ideas."[16]

While agreeing that the Word of God is, even in Scripture, accommodated to our fallen state, and that, as Calvin puts it, it "stutters" and "prattles" to us, I cannot see that this fact of itself is sufficient to disprove Warfield's contention that it is infallible: however the Word of God may, in its address to man, be short of its unveiled perfection, it could still be in such a form as perfectly suited its object, and without error.

2. Warfield's failure to take due account of man as fallen is seen rather in the fact that he takes no account of this when he speaks of the providence which prepares, and the superinduced inspiration which finally equips, the

15. The passage on pp. 198-9 referring to "the fault of the older dogmatists" suggests that Warfield's attitude is just the opposite of that for which McIntyre criticises him.
16. "Scottish Journal of Theology," vii, 1, p. 106.

writer of Scripture.[17] He cannot take due account of man as fallen, and allow that the writer's ordinary endowments play any part in the production of the documents, without allowing at least the possiblity of error creeping in. This does not mean of course that God must await perfect instruments before He can speak a clear word; but it does mean that there can be no *a priori* guarantee that the man whom God inspires will make no mistakes.

Torrance points to this when he says that the "scholastic idea of verbal inspiration" denies the uniqueness of the Incarnation of the Word (wherein there was a union of God and man — perfect in each case) by asserting here what "amounts to an incarnation of the Holy Spirit"[18] — a remark which recalls Tertullian's statement that "the Holy Spirit has been chased into a book."

J. F. PETER.

Book Reviews

CALVINS GESCHICHTSAUFFASSUNG

By Heinrich Berger (Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich), 1955, pp. 256; Fr. 14.55.

Calvin, in contrast to us moderns, was not interested in the subject of history as such, but only in so far as it is the medium of the divine economy of salvation through the vehicle of the church and the kingdom resting on the Word of God. Berger's book deals, therefore, with Calvin's views of church and kingdom as well as his criticism of the medieval church rather than with the subject of history as we understand it. This merely reflects Calvin's own perspective. His interest in the subject of history was only incidental to his preoccupation with the Church. Fundamentally, Calvin has contributed nothing to the subject of history; he simply accepted the traditional patterns. As a humanist he viewed history as "magistra vitae," and as a theologian he drew on Augustine's distinction between the "saeculum puerile" (the era of the Old Testament) and the "saeculum virile" (the era of the New Testament). His view of the history of the church is determined, as with the other reformers, by his polemic against the medieval church. With them he shares the belief in the "consensus quinquesaecularis," allowing that during the first five centuries the Church had remained comparatively pure and undivided.

There are, of course, certain emphases in the treatment of history which are more distinctly Calvin's. This is the case in his "collective" interpretation of Antichrist. To him, Antichrist is a kingdom which extends its rule over many generations. The victory over it will come not in any spectacular catastrophic fashion; it will be gradual through the expansion of the Gospel. Equally interesting is his introduction of the idea of a religious education of the human race into his view of history as well as the emphatic manner with which he insists that since the Ascension of Christ we live in an era without miracles. There is something distinctly "modern" in the drift of these ideas even if the same cannot be claimed for their motives.

17. See especially pp. 157-8.
18. "Scottish Journal of Theology," vii, 1, p. 107.

Berger's book should prove an extremely useful guide of information, dealing with the subject of church and kingdom from an angle that has rarely been selected for study, i.e., Calvin's view of history. Considering the solidity of the book, it is a pity that the author has yielded to the prevalent fashion among contemporary theologians of speaking of "Time" when they are speaking in fact about something else. Why, for instance, speak of Calvin's "Zeitbild" when what one is talking about is Calvin's view of church history?

Equally deplorable is the present obsession with the "aufwärtsführende Heilslinie." It is, I think, going a bit far when the author introduces this phrase on the strength of the following words taken from Calvin's commentry on Gen. 32:29: "for, though Jacob does acknowledge God, yet, not content with an obscure and slight knowledge, he wishes to ascend higher"!

These fortunately rare lapses in taste do in no way affect the true merit of the book which fills a real gap on our bookshelves.

H. H. REX.

THE CHRISTIAN ETHOS

By Werner Elert. Translated by Carl J. Schindler (Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia), 1957, pp. 451; $6.

These "Outlines of Lutheran Ethics," as the subtitle of the German original ("Das Christliche Ethos. Grundlinien der lutherischen Ethik, pp. 595; 1949) reads, may later be regarded as one of the theological classics of our time. One wonders why this subtitle has been deleted in the English translation and replaced, on the dust cover only, by the meaningless "The Foundations of the Christian Way of Life." The cause seems to be a certain disdain of modern Lntheranism for the old "confessionalism," as appears from the foreword in which Bishop Lilje in his non-committal way appraises the book as at least "ecumenical in outlook" and defends it against the suspicion of being "a product of denominational exclusiveness" — whatever that may be. What would the author, who died in 1954 after he had been for more than 30 years professor of historical and systematic theology at Erlangen, think about this sort of "Imprimatur"? Where will Protestant theology end, if we can no longer listen to the genuine voice of another confession? True ecumenicity demands that we carefully study the best books the theology of other churches can offer us. Even where they provoke our opposition they help us at least to clarify our own thoughts. Thus every serious theologian will be grateful to the enterprising Muhlenberg Press and to the translator for having made available in English this new approach to the problems of theological ethics.

While Elert's Dogmatics ("Der Christliche Glaube," 1940) had to be written in too short a time and was, therefore, as the author himself realised, not free from structural and other weaknesses, this work may be regarded as the maturest fruit of the life's work of a great scholar who was equally at home in the fields of theology, history, and sociology, an independent thinker who nevertheless takes a firm stand in a church which is bound to a strictly scriptural confession. Written in a beautiful, pointed, concise style whose brilliancy still shines through the translation, this book is not what usually is understood as a textbook on ethics. "Ethics" is defined as "the science of ethos," ethos being "the established behaviour of man as far as it is subject to being judged qualitatively." "The *Christian* ethos conceives of itself as the quality of man according to the *divine* judgment." Thus theological ethics is wholly different from philosophical ethics which does not know of a divine judgment.

Since "dogma" and "behaviour" are incommensurable, dogmatics and ethics cannot be regarded as parts of one "systematic theology," nor can ethics, as with K. Barth, become a part of dogmatics .Thus ethics becomes a theological discipline in its own right, though its content is closely bound up with dogmatics.

The arrangement of the subject matter results from the fact that God's judgment is of a twofold nature. "It appears as condemnatory or guilt judgment in the Law, as forgiveness in the Gospel." The distinction between Law (every Word of God which tells us what God commands us to do and what His punishment will be if we fail to do it) and Gospel (every Word of God which tells us what Christ has done for us) is for Luther and the Lutheran Church the mark of true theology. This *distinction,* which does not mean separation, provides the disposition of the book: "Ethos under Law" and "Ethos under Grace" are the main parts. They are followed by a third part, "Objective Ethos," which deals with the ethos of the Church as a corporate community and the relationship between the church and the forces of history. This does not mean that a sort of social ethics follows the ethics of the individual. For already Part I contains what used to be understood by social ethics. We give first a brief outline of the rich contents. "Ethos under Law" gives in chapters 1 ("The Creature") and 4 ("Sin and Guilt") a reinterpretation of the anthropology of the Bible and the Reformation. Chapter 2 deals with the "Law of God," chapter 3 with "The Natural Orders" (family; marriage; "the people"; State and Law; economic interdependence; truth, oath and honour). "Ethos under Grace describes in four chapters ("Encounter with Christ," "The New Creature," "The New Obedience," "The Invisible Struggle") the ethos of the believing sinner who, justified by faith and endowed with the gifts of the Holy Spirit, lives still in this world of sin and death. The spiritual background which lies behind every great theology becomes visible especially in the paragraph on prayer which, born out of the De profundis of a Christian life may serve as a first introduction into the spirit that pervades this book. "Objective Ethos" is a notable contribution to a new ecclesiology. The paragraphs on the "We" of the apologists, martyrs and confessions, and on "The Liturgical We" are highly illuminating.

One of the great achievements of this ethics is the clarification of the concept of "collective guilt" at the end of the first Part and in "The Liturgical We." The paragraph on "Natural Law" is too short, but it shows why this idea has been preserved in the Lutheran Confessions. A thorough discussion of the book is highly desirable, but it should avoid current prejudices. There is no real difference between Lutheranism and Calvinism of the 16th century regarding the attitude towards secular authority, even the terms of the confessions are almost identical, and Calvin's great chapter Inst. IV, 20 could have been written almost entirely at least by Melanchthon. There is on either side the same horror of a revolution. Barth has misinterpreted the Confessio Scotica (art. 14 and 24) in this respect. That there might be an active resistance against a power which has ceased to be authority in the sense of Rom. 13 (the classical text also for all Reformed confessions) is admitted also by Elert as by many earlier Lutheran theologians. Both Luther and Calvin had to fight the theological errors of the revolutionary enthusiasts, and only later the ideas of the Anabaptists and Quakers became a power in Reformed Christendom. As to the alleged servile attitude of the Lutheran Church towards the state, one has only to ask whether Luther's strong criticism of the princes would have been possible

in England, even at the time of Elizabeth. The problem of the two realms should be reconsidered in the light of Niebuhr's recent criticism of Barth. The real issue between the churches and within the churches is the problem of the "orders" and the problem of the Law. We should distinguish between the "orders" which go back into the status integritatis (Gen. 1:28) and orders of history like "people" (Amos 3:2; 9:7) and state. It is significant that the divine ordinance ("Dei ordinatio," "diatage" Rom. 13:2) is, according to the N.T., not what we call "state," but rather the "exousia," "potestas," the secular authority within the state. The "state" of the Christians is in heaven and not on earth ("politeuma" Phil. 3:20; "polis" Hebr. 13:14). Here lies one of the great weaknesses of Elert's ethics. His doctrine on the Law will meet with strong criticism on the part of Reformed theologians, but also of Lutherans. The clear distinction between Law and Gospel is essential for Lutheran theology and should be regarded by Reformed theology as a challenge, especially in view of the legalism of Puritanism. The real issue is the question of the uses of the Law. Luther and Calvin agree on the "usus politicus" and the "usus elenchticus," as Inst. II, 7 shows. The "third use," the use of the law for the regenerate as a rule of life is strongly emphasised by Calvin. Luther does not speak directly of a third use, as the Formula of Concord does. The passages from Luther adduced by the Formula are not genuine, but are added to the texts of Luther by adherents of Melanchthon, as Elert has definitely proved. This, however, does not mean that the substance of the doctrine is not present with Luther. His explanation of the decalogue should be sufficient to prove that Luther also knew of what was later called "the third use," though he never could separate the usus elenchticus from the usus tertius: The Law always accuses. Whether or not we should use the word "law" for the admonitions addressed to the believers is a matter of terminology. The N.T. knows of the "Law of Christ," the "Law of the Spirit," and the apostles made ample use of the commandments to instruct their young churches. The whole question is connected with the problem of the authority of the decalogue which can be deduced only from the use Christ has made of it, as Elert clearly sees. A new investigation of this problem is needed. Reformed theology should ask itself whether Puritanism has not destroyed the freedom with which Calvin still declared the Fourth (our third) Commandment to be fulfilled in Christ (Inst. II, 8, 32), and whether one has not to go further than Calvin by assuming that the entire ceremonial content of the Decalogue has been abrogated in the N.T. For Calvin as well as Barth (Dogmatics III, 4 p. 51 ff.) and Elert are mistaken when they assume that for the Primitive Church the Lord's Day was a substitute for the Sabbath. Jewish Christians celebrated both the Sabbath and the Lord's Day. Only the later Church regarded Sunday as the Christian Sabbath. On the other hand, Lutherans of Elert's persuasion must ask themselves why the Church since the days of the apostles has made so much use of the Decalogue. The great commandment of love is not sufficient, unless it is illustrated by the individual commandments. Why am I allowed to kill a wounded horse on the battlefield, while I must refuse the coup de grace to a soldier who in a situation where no medical help is available suffers unspeakable pains until he dies? Because there is a commandment of God. This aspect of the divine Law has not been sufficiently realised by Elert.

The translation is on the whole admirable. Some important passages have been omitted. The paragraph on "Natural Law" suffers from such omissions and even from mistakes (e.g. "social use" for

"proprius usus" p. 72 and the confusion of "para physin" and "kata physin" p. 75). A short list of "corrigenda," printed on a separate sheet, would be a great help to the readers of this otherwise highly commendable English edition.

H. SASSE.

Luther's Works. Two more volumes of the excellent English edition of Luther's Exegetical Works have been published in 1956 by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis: Vol. 13, containing the explanation of Psalms 65, 68, 82, 90, 101, 110, 111, 112, and vol. 21 containing Luther's sermons on the Sermon on the Mount and his famous explanation of the Magnificat, one of the finest devotional books ever written. The Publisher, the editor (Professor Pelikan, Chicago) and his team of translators are to be congratulated on this achievement. No theological library in the English-speaking world can do without this edition.

MYSTERY AND PHILOSOPHY

By Michael B. Foster. The Library of Philosophy and Theology (S.C.M. Press, London), 1957, pp. 96; 12/6.

Though the subject of this book is the mysterious, the style has a patient clarity. It is a lucid sorting out of the fundamental points at issue between the Philosophy of Analysis and the Christian understanding of the ultimate nature of things.

Michael Foster is a Student of Christ Church and Lecturer in Philosophy in the University of Oxford. He carefully defines the particular assumptions behind some expressions of the Philosophy of Analysis which he wishes to call in question. He has no complaint to make against "analysis" as such — he believes we need more of it in Christian theology. "What is to be questioned is 'not the practice of analysis but the belief that nothing is really puzzling and that therefore there cannot be anything unclear that we can legitimately want to say.'" This assumption, that, provided we ask the right questions, we can legitimately expect clear answers, is present in papers written by M. Schlick, R. Carnap, and H. Reichenbach and is present also in the English writers in this same field — Moore, Russell and Wittgenstein (though this last has written in the "Tractatus": "What can be said at all can be said clearly; and whereof one cannot speak thereof must one be silent"). In opposition to this assumption, Foster stresses the important place occupied in Christianity by "mystery" which he defines as "that which remains mysterious even when understood, because it exceeds our comprehension." This contradicts the proposition of Schlick: "no meaningful problem can be insoluble in principle."

The book is thus another round in the battle against Humanism, and it is not surprising that the first chapter closes with the suggestion that there is need for "a repentance in the sphere of the intellect," comparable to the experience through which Job went, "Now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes." The remaining chapters of the book deal with Mystery in Greek Philosophy, the Bible and its relationship to Science and Ethics. Foster holds that the Greek philosophers were more fundamentally theologians than they were scientists. For Plato "a philosopher is a human soul which remembers its own divinity and behaves as becomes a god." The logic and the science of the Greek philosophers were supported by a religious view of the world. The special character of Greek philosophy is that it continued in

wonder, its end was wondering contemplation of the divine in which mystery was not dispelled but more fully revealed. Modern science, on the other hand, and some modern philosophy aims to put us out of wonder.

Foster takes as example of concepts which we can understand and yet which remain mysterious such things as "the unity of the church" and the objectives prayed for in the first three clauses of the Lord's Prayer, "Hallowed be Thy name, Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done." The philosophical analyst says, "Specify your meaning, make it vulnerable to falsification, then I shall recognise that it means something."

But in each of these cases anything which can be specified (e.g., in relation to the unity of the church, such a specification as "the unity of the church will be achieved when all churches shall participate in an Assembly of the World Council of Churches") is something less than what the Christian user of the phrase usually hopes for and has in mind. Foster concludes: "It is annoying that this challenge (to specify meaning and so make it vulnerable to falsification) cannot be accepted, but it seems to be the case. It seems that the Christian cannot say with certainty 'this man is holy.' It seems that this is locating the action of God too precisely." But he concludes from this, not that the Christian is talking nonsense, but that he is talking about matters which because they are "mysteries" are beyond the power of human speech to define; the Christian quite gladly agrees with the analytic critic that he does not understand the meaning of what he is saying, and that therefore theological truths are "half-truths" in the sense that they do not, and cannot, communicate the whole truth — for the whole truth is so profound and massive, so mysterious, as to wait on God to reveal it. The difference is one of faith — the Christian believing that God uses human language as a vehicle or revelation. "Faith is not just another pipeline for the supply of a supplementary set of truths which in other aspects are like the truths of science. It is directed upon mystery, as revelation springs from mystery, and as prayer seems properly to be directed upon mysterious objects."

The whole issue could be summarised in terms of the words "apprehend" and "comprehend." Scientific and philosophical analyists throw emphasis on the possibility of man's apprehension of truth going on to complete comprehension. Foster sounds the warning that finite man cannot do more than apprehend the more ultimate mysteries of his existence.

Although this book only runs to 96 pages, it makes a fundamental contribution to the important current debate between Christians and the main "school" of contemporary philosophy.

J. C. ALEXANDER.

FOR FAITH AND FREEDOM

The Gifford Lectures in the University of Glasgow, 1955-57, by Leonard Hodgson, D.D., Regious Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford; Vol. I (Blackwell, Oxford), 1956, pp. 241; 34/9 (Aust.).

This first volume of Dr. Hodgson's Gifford Lectures contains five lectures headed "Introductory: For Faith," and five more headed "Natural Theology: For Freedom." The second volume, when it appears, is to be "Christian Theology: For Faith and Freedom." He starts with the Oxford philosophy of 1912, when he himself was a student, and surveys the changes which have taken place since. His central point is his rejection of the "two-source theory of knowledge,"

the "two sources" being Natural Theology and Revealed Theology, so that truths established by reason are supplemented by further truths given by Revelation. He holds that it is one and the same reason which operates in both spheres, and that Revelation consists in God's own mighty acts. The second set of five lectures deals with Creation, Freedom, Evil, in Natural Theology.

By many people this book is being welcomed as an important and valuable book. As for myself, I found myself assenting to most of what was said, but with a singular lack of enthusiasm; and I have been much exercised in trying to find out why this was. So far as I can see, it is that he seems to misconceive the meaning of Biblical Theology. He thinks that it is really bringing back in a new guise the "two-source theory," by its strong preference for Hebrew rather than Greek modes of thought. To be sure, the Hebrew mind does not deal at all with the forms of Greek conceptual logic, and the Bible, while witnessing to God's mighty acts, does interpret them by a definite teaching, a *kerygma*. And surely it is wrong to think of Revelation as conveyed in God's mighty acts only, and interpreted simply by man's reason; the Revelation does include the work of the Spirit interpreting the acts of God in prophecy, preaching, liturgy, psalm, poetical imagery. Something, surely, is being missed in the somewhat logical and intellectualist approach of these lectures; perhaps at bottom it is the distinction which F. D. Maurice always made between God's own Truth and the Word which God speaks, and our human ideas, notions and doctrines.

To get at the point in another way: I found myself deeply shocked by Dr. Hodgson's insistence (pp. 108-111) that the phrase "Justification by Faith" has now outlived its usefulness, on the ground that the doctors disagree about the meaning of the word "faith"; thus for instance Nygren on *Romans* cites on this point seven theologians, and affirms in each case that "it must be declared with the utmost emphasis that nothing was further from Paul's mind than this" (Nygren, p. 68). Since then we cannot agree what "faith" means, we should not go on talking about "Justification by Faith." Surely a singularly weak argument! As well might it have been argued in the fourth century that St. Athanasius' insistence on the *homoousion* was all wrong, since the doctors of that date did very definitely disagree. In fact Justification by (through) Faith is as central a point in Christian dogma as the doctrine of the Incarnation; and the theologian of to-day must decide whether he will stand with Dr. Hodgson and his Oxford logic, or with Reinhold Niebuhr who in his Gifford Lectures saw all theological and all political thinking, both of the Right and the Left, as subject to the Judgment of God. It is significant that in Hodgson's look there is a lecture on Creation, but no treatment of Original Sin. Which will we have, Hodgson or Niebuhr?

GABRIEL HEBERT, S.S.M.

THE RENEWAL OF THE CHURCH

By W. A. Visser 't Hooft (S.C.M. Press, London), 1956, pp. 128; 12/6.

CHRIST AND THE CHURCH

By Anders Nygren, translated by Alan Carlsten (S.P.C.K., London), 1957, pp. 125; 10/6.

In a recent essay Dr. A. R. Vidler remarked: "A rejuvenation of theology is not likely to be brought about by the intellectual refinement in which liberal divines excel." Modern theological

scholarship can show a goodly crop of fruit; but it needs to be harvested and turned into food for the strengthening of the Church. The two books before us are notable examples of just such a process; and to each the cliche might be applied that its importance is out of all proportion to its size. Two formidable theological minds seek to learn the lessons taught by the Bible and the Church's history and theology for the well-being of the Church to-day. Both are much concerned by the theological issues raised by the churches' confrontation with each other in the ecumenical movement, and with the consequent search for unity.

Dr. Visser 't Hooft in *The Renewal of the Church* (S.C.M. Press) takes hold of a phrase often used and asks what the Bible means by renewal, what have been and what are the conditions of true renewal in the life of the Church. Renewal is to be confused neither with mere innovation nor with any attempt to replace the Church which began at Pentecost. To be ecclesia semper reformanda — the history of the phrase is illuminatingly set forth in a brief paragraph — the Church must take radically seriously her existence as the people with whom God has entered into a new covenant of grace: that is to say she is at once redeemed by Christ and is moving towards the hour of her complete salvation. These two focal points of the Church's life, her nature and destiny, condition both the attitude which separated Christians ought now to take towards one another, and the attitude which the Church should have towards the world through which she is passing and of whose judgment and redemption she is the herald. An immense range of theological writing — Biblical, ancient, reformation, and modern; Roman, Orthodox, Anglican and Protestant — is put to use by Dr. 't Hooft, whose own characteristically lucid and incisive style is however never lost under this weight of learning. The Churches have cause to be grateful to God that at the formative stage of the World Council of Churches such a theological mind as that of the author of this book should have been available for its guidance and service as General Secretary.

Bishop Nygren discusses another of the themes much under debate at present: *Christ and His Church* (S.P.C.K.). After a preliminary look at the question, "Is the Church a part of the Gospel?" Dr. Nygren summarises the Messianic expectations current before Christ (distinguishing carefully between those points on which there would be general agreement and those on which scholars — not least Scandinavians — are still divided); he goes on to shew how these expectations were at once upset and fulfilled in the person and work of Christ (basing this on a series of brief but brilliant exegetical notes). It is *this* **Christ** — the Christ of the good news — who is present with His Church and confers upon her the unity which she in turn must realise by penetrating more deeply into the truth and love which have been given to her in her Lord. Those concerned with the unity and well-being of the Church in Australia might well meditate upon the questions raised in these two books; for as Bishop Nygren says, "The way to the centre is the way to unity. If one seeks the unity of the Church, then one must pursue the relevant questions to their central issues."

J. D. McCAUGHEY.

LUTHER ON VOCATION

By Gustaf Wingren, translated by Carl C. Rasmussen (Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia), 1957; XII and 256 pages; $3.50.

This excellent translation of one of the outstanding works of present-day Swedish theology is perhaps the best introduction into the theology of the Reformer. It is more than the modest title suggests. By examining one basic thought of Luther's in the context of his whole theology, the author, professor of systematic theology at Lund, has elucidated the sometimes embarrassing wealth of Luther's thoughts. He has avoided the dangers of systematising and modernising Luther on the one hand, and of writing a mere historical monograph on the other. Luther uses "vocation" ("Beruf") in three meanings. Vocation can mean the calling of man by God to faith. It can mean the calling of a man into the ministry of the church. It can mean the "calling" in the sense of work, occupation, "vocation," as Luther found it, in harmony with the translators of the King James version, in 1 Cor. 7:20. (An English counterpart of K. Holl's examination of the history of the world "Beruf" in *Gesammelte Aufsætze zur Kirchengeschichte,* vol. III, pp. 189-219 would be most illuminating.) Only in this sense the word is meant here. While every man, Christian or non-Christian, has his "station" ("Stand") as father, wife, son, farmer, judge, etc., the Christian's "station" implies his vocation, the work he has to do. As vocation in the Middle Ages primarily denotes the "call to the cloister," it is not surprising that Luther developed his idea of the "vocation" of each individual Christian after he had rejected the validity of monastic vows (1521). The meaning of this concept is discussed in three chapters. "Earth and Heaven" discusses the problem from the point of view of the two realms or kingdoms in which the Christian lives "with the Spirit in the paradise of grace and peace and with the flesh in the world of toil and cross " (Luther). This chapter should destroy many current prejudices, especially if read in comparison with Calvin's doctrine on the two realms ("duplex regimen," "duo regimina," "regnum spirituale" and "regnum politicum"; Inst. III, cap. 19, 15). While these two kingdoms "stand side by side and are not hostile to one another per se," there is at the same time to be distinguished two other kingdoms, the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of the devil. These are antagonistic. The situation of the Christian who lives on the battlefield where the fight goes on is described in chapter II, "God and the Devil." The last chapter, "Man," summarises the results and presents at the same time new aspects of the situation of man between heaven and earth, God and the devil. It is impossible to give a full account of the rich contents of each of these chapters. Suffice it to say that almost all aspects of Luther's theology are discussed (Law and Gospel, the "orders") — in a very sober way — the problems of secular government, the forgiveness as the core of the Gospel. Special attention may be called to the paragraphs on "Faith and Love," "Cross and Desperation" (chap. I), "Regeneration" (chap. II), "Prayer" (chap. III). Everywhere the spiritual background of Luther's theological thinking becomes visible. It is obvious that the Reformation can be understood only if we understand what realities "God," "Christ," "The Word," "The Devil," for Luther must have been. Some questions remain open. Wingren, like Elert, shows that Luther did not speak of a "third use of the law." How, then, is his explanation of the decalogue to be understood? While the meaning of baptism is made clear, the question remains as to what absolution and the Sacrament of the Altar mean for the Christian. In a book which sees the weakness of the modern emphasis on the young Luther this question should not be passed over, especially in view of what the sacrament meant for Luther himself in his situation between heaven and earth, God and the devil. The book in its English form should find many

grateful readers. In a new edition Luther's "Schwaermer" should be rendered by "enthusiasts" (instead of "fanatics"). As it always gives the title of the writings of Luther from which the quotations are taken, this book can lead to a real study of Luther. It should be read together with such writings like the explanation of the Magnificat or Luther's sermons on Matt. 5-7 which now are available in the new English edition.

H. SASSE.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Messiah in the Old Testament, by Helmer Ringern. Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 18 (S.C.M., 7/6). Not everyone in the British tradition of biblical scholarship is willing to accept the so-called Scandinavian approach to the question of the New Year Festival, and its adoption as an annual event by Israel. The theory puts great emphasis upon a cultic pattern common to the ancient near-eastern lands. But in this short, and may it be said, very simple and clear study, one of those Swedish scholars very persuasively fits the concept of the Messiah into this cultic pattern. Those Psalms which the Scandinavians have isolated and called "royal Psalms," and which were thought to have been written for and recited at the annual festival, are here seen to be messianic. Thereafter the more "orthodox" messianic passages are examined, and the so-called "Servant Songs," which include a number of "suffering servant" Psalms. The study concludes with a few compact paragraphs, in which Ringern declares his faith that the messianic self-conciousness of Jesus may be the flowering of the ancient cultic pattern whose roots precede even the kingship in Judah and Israel.

G. A. F. Knight.

Essays on Typology, by G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woollcombe. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 22 (S.C.M. Press, 7/6). This little book should serve as a useful corrective of the extreme and false interpretations that are proposed by some of the addicts of typology. There are two independent essays, but they are not unrelated. Dr. Lampe writes in general terms on The Reasonableness of Typology, and makes it clear that there is need to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate typology. Mr. Woollcombe takes a historical line in discussing The Biblical Origins and Patristic Development of Typology, and against the faults of those who followed the symbolic typology of Hellenistic Platonism he sets the historical typology as it appears in the New Testament. The essays are informative, and indicate that there is validity, if much restricted, in the typological method of exegesis, provided it follows the use of the New Testament.

The Problem of History in Mark, by James M. Robinson. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 21 (S.C.M. Press, 8/-). This study, which ranges wider than its title might suggest, is a investigation into Mark's religious attitude, seeking to discover how Mark understood history and particularly the history of Jesus, and how this affected the treatment of his subject matter. After a general discussion of the problem of history in interpreting Mark, there are chapters on Mark's own Introduction (1:1-13), the significance of the Exorcism Narratives, the Debates within Mark, History since A.D. 30 in Mark, and, finally, Historical Attitude and Communal History, with an index of authors and of Biblical references. The presentation and discussion of material are detailed but concentrated, and this does

not make for easy reading, but its freshness and scholarly treatment make it a very worthwhile study. It is stimulating and important, and deserves attention by all who are seriously interested in the Gospels. They will be challenged even where they may not agree.

New Testament Faith for To-day, by Amos N. Wilder (S.C.M. Press, 15/-). Most of this book has already appeared in print, and four of its six chapters rest upon lectures given in 1948, much expanded and re-written. The first chapter is concerned with the commendation of the Gospel in our time. The second, which appears to be the most recent, is a persuasive discussion of "The Language of Faith," and is perhaps the best. As against those who are determined to delete "mythology" from the Christian message, it is stressed that "mythology in the sense of imaginative presentation is essential in religion," and there is a timely reminder that "faith of any great stature has to have its own kind of rhetoric, its own kind of vehicle and symbols." There are chapters on The Proclamation of Jesus, The Message of Paul, and The Johannine Witness, and these contain much that is interesting and good. Throughout the book, Bultmann's views are fairly and sympathetically presented, but they are rightly criticised as often inadequate and unsatisfactory.

C. S. Petrie.

The Cross of Christ, by Vincent Taylor (Macmillan, London, 17/6 Aust.). This mainly consists of a lucid popular exposition of the author's important work on the N.T. teaching of the Atonement which has been set out in his earlier substantial writings. Dr. Taylor, in interpreting the Atonement as an objective deed of a representative rather than a substitutionary character manifests considerable sympathy in what he describes as the Sacrificial view with the moral satisfaction theory. Thus in moving language, reminiscent of McLeod Campbell and R. C. Moberly, he concludes that "our penitence . . . needs to expand its broken wings by resting upon a perfect penitence voiced by the Son of God, somewhat as our inarticulateness finds expression in great music and great poetry" (p. 96).

The Early Christian Fathers, edited and translated by Henry Bettenson (Oxford University Press, London, 26/6 Aust.). A generation of students, already greatly indebted to Mr. Bettenson for his most usable selection of *Documents of the Christian Church,* will welcome this further volume which aims to illustrate from the writings of the Fathers "the process of development in Christian thought, life, and worship" up to Nicaea. This selection, containing of necessity its greater part from the works of Irenaeus, Tertullian and Origen, is wisely chosen for its purpose, and the translation, clear and fresh, often gains in pointedness through contemporary expression in vivid phrases. Thus, Tertullian is effectively modernised in his reference to the nations being thrown open to the devil "with vacant posseession" (p. 176) and in his denial that money is paid out from the common fund of Christians for "inelegant 'blow-outs' " (p. 196). A concise introduction indicating the significance of the various Fathers and brief annotations upon the text where necessary will make this selection one of great value, especially for the student in theology.

Christ the Fulfiller, by Gabriel Hebert (The Anglican Truth Society, Sydney, 3/-). A study in Biblical types, this booklet sets out,

in contrast to fanciful detours, "the broad highway of sound biblical interpretation" as "a biblical symbol occurring *first* in its literal meaning, and *second* in the prophetic promises of the coming day of the Lord, and *thirdly* in the New Testament fulfilment" (p. 28). This line thus indicated is traced in the themes of the Exodus, the Bridegroom and the Bride, the Law, the Manna and the Water from the Rock, and Jerusalem. A discerning and profitable study.

History of the Hungarian Reformed Church, edited by Imre Reverez, translated by George A. F. Knight (The Hungarian Reformed Association of America, 1801 "P" St. N.W. — Washington 6, D.C., n.p.). This translation and abridgment of an important Hungarian publication of 1949 which has been made by Professor G. A. F. Knight, of Dunedin (formerly of the Church of Scotland Jewish Mission at Budapest), will serve a most useful purpose since, owing to geographical, linguistic and other factors, the history of Hungarian Protestantism and in it that of the Reformed Church is "almost like a *lacuna* in the general text of the story of Evangelical Protestantism" (p. i). The last chapter, bringing the story up to date, was written by Professor Knight himself. This small volume, admirably illustrated, gives a vivid sketch of a courageous and continuing witness under Turk and Habsburg, Nazi and Communist. The Reformation and Counter-Reformation, the Unitarian threat and the Puritan revival, the nineteenth century rationalistic decline and the recent rediscovery of the Gospel, in addition to the recurring theme of the internal organisation of the Church and its relationship with the State — the delineation of all these phases constitute, in the words of the writers of the Preface "this very timely history of a confessing Church" (p. iv).

The Perfect Prayer, by Herman Hoeksema (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Michigan, U.S.A., $3.00). The writer, following the order of the Heidelberg Catechism, here, in his exposition of the Lord's Prayer (in which we speak to God) draws a general comparison with the Law of God (in which God speaks to us), in that as there the first table dominates the entire Law, so here the first three petitions indicate that our prayers should be motivated above all by the love of God. The writer adopts the view that there are six petitions, the last requesting basically the same blessing, in the first clause negatively and in the second positively (and eschatologically). "The one asks for preservation, the other for perfect deliverance" (p. 179). This the tenth and concluding volume in the series maintains an admirable blend of devotional and theological commentary so appropriate in the exposition of that Catechism which has been described as "the product of the best qualities of head and heart and its prose is frequently marked by the beauty of a lyric."

R. Swanton.

Bible Doctrine, Unit Two: Book One, by D. Partington Anderson (Orthodox Presbyterian Church, 728 Schaff Building, 1505 Race St., Philadelphia 2, $1.50. Also Answer Book, $0.35). This is the third volume in the series covering questions 39 to 87 of the Shorter Catechism — the section dealing with the Law of God. If anything it improves on the two excellent volumes which preceded it. The writer has successfully mastered the art of presenting Scriptural teaching in a manner calculated not only to arouse interest, but also to cause the student to grasp the salient points of each study.

The work is bright and up to date in both form and content, and there are plenty of illustrations. Pictures of our Lord are deliberately excluded. An edition containing a teacher's guide is available, and there is also a book of answers to questions asked. The publication is to be highly recommended as a text book for junior Bibles classes.

F. M. Bradshaw.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither precludes nor implies subsequent comment.)

Basil Blackwell, Oxford: *Visible Saints: The Congregational Way 1640-1669*, Geoffrey F. Nuttall, 41/6 (Aust.); *Subjectivity and Paradox: A Study of Kierkegaard*, J. Heywood Thomas, 18/6; *The Text of the O.T.*, E. Würthwein, n.p.

Eerdmans, Grand Rapids: *The Letter to the Hebrews*, Johannes Schneider, $2.50; *Inspiration and Revelation*, ed. J. W. Walvoord, $4.50; *The Gospels: An Expanded Translation*, Kenneth S. Wuest, $3.50; *Responsible Protestantism; The Christian's Role in Secular Society*, Cecil De Boer, $3.50; *Interpreting Relevation*, Merill C. Tenney, $3.50; *When the Time was Fully Come*, Herman N. Ridderbos, $1.50; *Is There a Conflict Between Genesis I and Natural Science*, N. H. Ridderbos, $1.50; *Through the Pentatench Chapter by Chapter*, W. H. Griffith Thomas, $3.00.

Inter-Varsity Fellowship, London: *Dipsychos: A Case-History of Spiritual Ill-Health*, 3d.

Leslie Press, London: *The Sacrament of Reconciliation*, Thomas M. Donn, 7/6.

Longmans, Green, London: *Words and Images*, E. L. Mascall, 15/6 (Aust.).

Muhlenberg, Philadelphia: *The Christian Year*, E. T. Horn, $3.75; *Are You Looking for God?*, Edmund A. Steimle, $2.25.

W. R. Smith Paterson, Brisbane: *Profile of John Calvin and The Institutes*, Harold Whitney, 20/-.

S.C.M., London: *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers*, ed. G. H. Williams & A. M. Mergal, 35/-; *Promise and Fulfilment*, W. G. Kümmel, 12/6; *The Temple of Jerusalem*, Andre Parrot, 9/6; *Golgotha and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre*, Andre Parrot, 10/6; *The Wisdom of the Fathers*, Erik Routley, 8/6; *Plato and the Christians*, Adam Fox, 21/-; *The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology*, George S. Hendry, 12/6; *Essays in Liberality*, Alec R. Vidler, 15/-; *The State in the New Testament*, Oscar Cullman, 12/6; *Fundamentalism and the Church of God*, Gabriel Hebert, 15/-; *A Year with the Bible*, John Marsh, 15/-; *The Meaning of Persons*, Paul Tournier, 21/-; *Selected Letters of Samuel Rutherford*, 8/6; *The Gospels and the Religions*, Walter Freytag, 3/-; *The Communication of the Gospel to Illiterates*, H. R. Weber, 7/6; *Metaphysical Beliefs*, ed. Alasdair MacIntyre, 25/6.

Tyndale, London: *Some Thoughts on Faith Healing*, ed. Vincent Edmunds & C. Gordon Scorer, 2/6; *The Limits of Medical Responsibility*, A. S. Aldis, 6d.; *Faith and Medicine*, Andre Schlemmer, 2/6; *Christian Faith and Science*, 1/6; *Paul Before the Areopagus and Other N.T. Studies*, N. Stonehouse, 15/-; *God Became Man*, A. M. Stibbs, 1/6; *The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts*, F. F. Bruce, 2/-; *Scripture and Myth*, P. E. Hughes, 1/6; *The Christian and the State*, H. M. Carson, 1/6; *Principles of Conduct: Aspects of Biblical Ethics*, John Murray, 15/-.

Book Reviews

Page

BERGER, HEINRICH: Calvins Geschichtsauffassung 84
By the Rev. Professor H. H. Rex, M.A., D.Theol., Knox College, University of Otago.

ELERT, WERNER: The Christian Ethos 85
By the Rev. Professor H. Sasse, D.Theol., Immanuel Seminary, Adelaide.

FOSTER, MICHAEL B.: Mystery and Philosophy 88
By the Rev. J. C. Alexander, M.A., B.D., Vice-Master, Ormond College, University of Melbourne.

HODGSON, LEONARD: For Faith and Freedom 89
By the Rev. A. G. Hebert, M.A., D.D., S.S.M., St. Michael's House, Crafers, S.A.

NYGREN, ANDERS: Christ and the Church
't HOOFT, VISSER: The Renewal of the Church 90
By the Rev. Professor J. D. McCaughey, M.A., Ormond College, University of Melbourne.

WINGREN, GUSTAF: Luther on Vocation 91
By the Rev. Professor H. Sasse.

SHORTER NOTICES 93

BOOKS RECEIVED 96

W. D. VAUGHAN PTY. LTD. Print, 126-128 Denmark Street, Kew, E.4

NOV 1 8 1957